

From: [Linda Jarrett](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: 4th grade Proposed standards for Social Studies
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:06:41 AM

There appears to be a lot of crossover between 3rd and 4th grade expectations. 4th grade has been the year of learning about your state history and moving that down to 3rd grade will cause a loss of history that will be taught. 4th grade brains and content schedules are able to handle more focus on Missouri history. The older grades need to focus on the United States and World History, and not 4th grade.

Thank you for your considerations.

From: [Michael Hill](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards - Geometry
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 7:07:15 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

Standard GPE A2 - Derive the equation of a parabola given a focus and directrix.

While I see that this is a progression from Algebra I, it does not fit into the rest of the Geometry curriculum; however, it fits nicely into Algebra 2 – along with the rest of the conics.

Michael Hill
Rolla High School
Mathematics Teacher

From: [Wesley Townsend](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Comments regarding proposed new learning standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 8:23:40 AM

One overall concern is that adopting this newest iteration of standards will limit or eliminate in all four areas the use of the external resources and materials that are field-tested and proven to be reliable, valid and research-based to support instruction.

Other concerns that have been identified include:

- The writing standards are redundant and lack complexity and rigor
- Organization of the clusters lacks clarity – for example in Reading 6-12, standards are identified as “Approaching text as a reader” and “Approaching text as a writer”
- K-5 and 6-12 ELA strands do NOT align
- Research standards are weak and vague
- The MLS standards were overall fewer, clearer and higher (more rigorous)

Thank you.

Wesley Townsend

Superintendent, Pleasant Hill R-III School District

From: [Byrd, April](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Matthew.Zoph](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards comments
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 8:26:16 AM
Attachments: [Proposed Standards-Notes.docx](#)

Attached are suggestions for improvement to the proposed standards. Thank you for allowing us to provide input.

Thank you,
April Byrd
Curriculum Coordinator
Grandview R-2 School District
11470 Highway C
Hillsboro, MO 63050

Proposed Standards

Notes from Grandview R2 School District Curriculum Team
3/1/16

Suggestions for improvement highlighted in yellow.

Overall:

- Numbering systems are either nonexistent, inconsistent, and don't match up with any other groups of standards out there. Will make curriculum planning and searching for standards very difficult. **Numbering systems should be consistent and standard throughout grade levels and subject.**

K-5 Reading & Writing:

- Independent Text Strand-no correlation to 6-12 standards? **Every elementary standard should have 6-12 correlation.**
- 4-5 Poetry standards: **identify forms of poetry and explain structural elements missing, these are critical skills and should be added to 4 & 5 grade standards**
- Text Features (nonfiction)-What specific features need to be taught at each grade level? **(glossary, index, captions, bold words, etc.)**
- Digital Media Literacy-new addition, a positive that this has been added
- Writing: Separate strands added for each step in the writing process-Love this! (prewriting, draft, revise/edit, produce/publish/share)
- Writing: Research process more specific and clearly defined
- Speaking and Listening: includes specific standards for giving presentations to peers- definitely a positive addition

6-12 Reading & Writing:

- Standards are broken apart and more detailed.
 - CCSS- *"Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings."*
 - Proposed-*"Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative, connotative, and content-specific meanings using context, affixes, or reference materials."*
- Asks students to "Explain how the text reflects **historical and/or cultural** contexts." Which isn't taught in CCSS.
- Writing research standards 6-12 say to follow a **"standard format for citation."** **Could this be more specific? APA or MLA formats are used in collegiate level. If these are taught in high school, students would be more prepared to compose college level papers**

K-5 Math:

- 5th Grade Math-(Albert):
 - Volume as additive has been removed—this is a positive as it was developmentally too difficult at this grade level
 - Rarely mentions using models
 - Requires students to “justify” answers, but doesn’t give specific example of HOW they will be asked to justify
 - Standards broken into more pieces and more simply written which is helpful
- Overall not as specific in many areas:
 - CCSS KOAA3-“Decompose numbers less than or equal to 10 into pairs in more than one way, e.g., by using objects or drawings, and record each decomposition by a drawing or equation”
 - Proposed KRA3-“Decompose numbers less than or equal to 10 in more than one way.”
- Heading titles for strands do not match up for grade levels. Example: Geometry and Measurement: Work with time and money. Kinder standards on page 96, first grade on page 98, grade 2 on page 99. Standards of like strand/topic should be visible on the same page like they are for reading standards.
- No standards for money past 2nd grade (vaguely mentioned in 4th grade)? Should be added in increasing complexity up to 5th grade.
- Time not assessed at all in 5th grade. This should be added as elapsed time or time interval.

6-12 Math:

- No advanced standards past Algebra 2 and Geometry for college prep or advanced courses like there were in common core.
- Overall general principles of mathematics should be included for each grade level as an overall focus for the grade level

K-5 Science:

- The addition of Engineering, Technology, and Application of Science allows for inclusion of STEM activities to increase problem solving & critical thinking.

6-12 Science:

- No longer broken down by class: Biology, Chemistry, Physics, etc. Proposed standards are grouped by Physical Science, Life Science, Earth & Space Science, Engineering/Technology. This will make splitting up standards amongst teachers and classes difficult.

K-5 Social Studies:

- Missouri specific standards have moved down from 4th to 3rd grade. Several time periods and topics moved around. This will present a significant cost in purchasing all new curriculum material.
- Many standards too vague or leave open to interpretation: Standard 6A (4th grade): *"Compare cultural characteristics across historical time periods."* These need to be specific as to exactly which events and time periods per grade level. Otherwise it leaves a wide range of interpretation for schools when aligning curriculum. Students who switch schools may miss big pieces of information due to wide variances in time periods/events being taught.

6-12 Social Studies:

- Standards very vague-need to be specific as to which event, time period, culture, historical figures, etc. to be taught at each grade
- New curriculum because Geography has never been a part of middle school- would have to be a different course
- Not taught in sequence
- Layout very confusing & too many grade levels grouped together—all standards 6-8 are grouped together and should be separated by grade level. Otherwise how will districts decide which standards to teach at each grade level? If all schools separate these differently, students who change districts will be at a disadvantage with gaps in learning.

From: [Todd Willhite](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: concerns
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 8:30:28 AM

Here are some concerns that have been shared with me regarding the proposed standards:

- The writing standards are redundant and lack complexity and rigor
- Organization of the clusters lacks clarity – for example in Reading 6-12, standards are identified as “Approaching text as a reader” and “Approaching text as a writer”
- K-5 and 6-12 ELA strands do NOT align
- Research standards are weak and vague
- The MLS standards were overall fewer, clearer and higher (more rigorous)

--

Todd Willhite
Superintendent
Salisbury R-IV Schools
1000 S. Maple Ave.
Salisbury, MO 65281

Phone: 660-388-6699
Fax: 660-388-6753

From: [Rachael Hitch](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Elementary Social Studies Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 8:57:20 AM

I hate to see that all the Missouri History standards have been moved from 4th grade down to 3rd grade. Mainly because there are many schools, including mine, that have 4th grade teachers that have worked tirelessly to create amazing projects, units, field trip opportunities, etc. to cover the Missouri history learning standards. This amount of work that is put in makes those creations very personal, like these projects and units are our baby! And if these standards continue as written, we will no longer be able to teach them. Fourth grade in our building is known for Missouri Day, the Jefferson City field trip, Lewis and Clark, Westward Ho, and many more. We would love to continue that tradition.

--

Rachael Hitch
Fourth Grade Teacher
LWJ Elementary

Statement of Confidentiality

The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for addressee. The information may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or phone +1 573-265-2300 and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

From: [Raney, Susan J.](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: K-5 proposed standards comments
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:11:09 AM

the following are suggestions for K-5 proposed standards, hope they make sense.

Grade 5

PS1 is missing a very fundamental concept that will connect A to B
Need to add a standard to identify substances based on their properties before you can determine if there have been changes when substances are combined.

Two standards are redundant page 5 PS3 B is basically the same as page 7 PS4 B – Neither fit well in grade 5. The standard would be a better fit to include in grade 4 when studying waves and light energy PS4B

Not sure why simple machines are in the energy section when they apply more to work and forces

PS3 needs a foundational standard to describe that the energy in a food chain comes from the Sun to help with understanding LS2 standards to include not only the transfer of matter but also energy

Grade 4

Move PS1B to grade 5 as a part of using properties of materials to separate a mixture when studying mixing substances in PS1-4

The PS2 forces need to be moved down because of the developmental readiness and ability to concretely investigate forces and make room for PS3 standards on energy which will require more time.

Two standards on page 5 are very redundant under PS3B suggest to replace the second with transfer of energy during collisions

The combination of lessons on force at the same time as Energy can be developmentally confusing for students and the two may become mixed and misconceptions could arise – move forces to grade 3 and leave the more abstract energy in grade 4. Energy goes well with waves too, with a continued study of the relationship between movement and energy.

This focus on energy and waves makes it sensible to move PS4B from grade 5 to grade 4

Wondering why LS1A (structure standards) are in both grade 4 and grade 5 the two seem to be able to both be taught during grade 4 when learning about parts and senses. I suggest moving standards on page 8 LS1A from grade 5 to grade 4.

Grade 3

With the suggestion of moving forces PS2 to grade 3 PS1A solids liquids and gases should be moved to grade 2 with observable properties of matter a natural fit. As it is now it will be a redundancy of

standards taught in grade 2.

PS2B magnetic forces on page 3 will go nicely when the other force standards on page 3 in fourth grade are moved to grade 3.

Page 8 the LS1A standard is very similar to the standards on pages 12 and 13 in LS4 B and C much redundancy with these three nearly identical standards.

The ESS1B standard is all alone without any other standards and should be removed from grade 3. The concept will be investigated in grade 5. More emphasis on weather can include how sun affects weather which is a more connected place for observations of the Sun. Could be in grade 1 with a study of light and shadows and the universe standards.

Need to add something about animal behavior that helps them survive within LS2D to grade 3.
Need to add similarities and differences between parents and offspring to LS3A

Grade 2

On page 2 the PS1A and B standards should be moved from grade 3 to accompany standards on properties of matter in grade 2 a natural fit to observable properties and changes which are evidence that help in mixing and separation.

By moving force standards PS2 from grade 4 to grade 3 on page 3 the mass and force standard in grade 2 should be moved to grade 4 to round out the concept of cause and effect relationships of force and motion

PS4A keep with grade 1 redundant to have two grades in a row, not sure the purpose to learn same thing twice when there is such limited time for science in elementary classrooms and many other topics to learn

I suggest moving LS1A on page 8 to page 13 LS4D as observations of plant and animal diversity to survive different habitats.

Grade 1

I suggest removing the mass/weight standard on page 2 for developmental reasons – measurement at this age should be nonstandard units and the first standard in the column is sufficient for comparing the property of mass/weight

I suggest removing PS3A - Energy is a very abstract concept and should be a part of changing solids, liquids and gasses in grade 2 so that it can be observed in a more concrete investigation.

Measurement of temperature at this age should be related to weather only (can be a part of weather in kindergarten). I feel this is a forcing of the concept and may contribute to misconceptions

On page 7 PS4B should be replaced with observations of light, the interaction of objects and light, and shadows – NOT temperature

On page 9 need to add growth and development standard for parent and babies

Why include weather standards – stick to seasons? Seems like there are a wide range of standards for the time available for science in grade 1 and may cause them to be covered rather than learned. Teachers may simply jump from topic to topic rather than developing a concept.

Kindergarten

I suggest moving the first grade PS2A on page 3 to kindergarten to accompany the standard on pushes and pulls to deepen the understanding.

Page 5 has a major problem including forces in the energy concept – the push pull standard needs to be removed.

Page 7 PS4 sound will be taught in grade 1 again time is limited in elementary science – no time to teach the same concepts over and over when others need time. Same issue with page 14 ESS1A keep the focus on objects in the sky to grade 1 and remove from Kindergarten

ESS3B on page 18 needs to be moved to page 19 within C human impact and replaced with a standard on responding to severe weather.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Raney
SLPS Science Curriculum Specialist PK-12

From: [David Bond](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: comment on standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:11:42 AM

Our curricula is entirely determined by testing. We have no science or social studies instruction until fifth grade to attempt to maximize MAP scores. My school district will resist make changes to instruction that doesn't prep students for a MAP or EOC test. De-emphasizing testing is essential if you want us to develop our science courses according to these proposed goals. Was testing and pointless data collection intended to hold students back?

Statement of Confidentiality

The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for addressee. The information may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or phone +1 573-265-2300 and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

From: [Michele Irby](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:52:23 AM

- The writing standards are redundant and lack complexity and rigor
- Organization of the clusters lacks clarity – for example in Reading 6-12, standards are identified as “Approaching text as a reader” and “Approaching text as a writer”
- K-5 and 6-12 ELA strands do NOT align
- Research standards are weak and vague
- The MLS standards were overall fewer, clearer and higher (more rigorous)
- * the Mathematical Practice Standards for K-12 are not included from the CCSS which reduces the higher order thinking requirement in Mathematics

Michele Irby
Mathematics Teacher
Orrick High School

From: [Kim Chronister](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: comments
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:09:30 AM

Standard(s) for comment	Remarks
Reading Literary Texts 2A 9 th -12: 2C 9 th – 12 th 2D 11 th -12 th Reading Informational Texts 2A 9 th -12:	It seems far too subjective to ask the students to analyze how the author's choice about anything impacts them. We are teaching "general education majors" in high school. They have not decided to specialize in English Studies. Far too many of our students struggle with reading and comprehension to bog them down with trying to figure out why the author choose one word over another and how those choices impact the individual students.

Kim Chronister
Oran R-III
Communication Arts Teacher
Yearbook Advisor
Junior High Student Council Advisor

From: [Kristy Locke](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:20:41 AM

I was reviewing the 6-12 Mathematics Grade-Level Expectations. My opinion is that GPE-A should be an Algebra 2 objective, not a geometry objective. I know in the past I have worked with equations parabolas and circles in Algebra 2 and 3, but not in Geometry. I feel that this is a better fit of an algebra objective than a geometry objective. I also feel that CP-A, which deals with probability is not a geometry objective. Thanks for taking my opinions into consideration.

Kristy Locke
Brunswick R-II School

From: [Karen Hammond](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: New Standards for Science
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:49:24 AM

I have the following concerns regarding the grades 6-12 Science standards that are being considered for adoption:

HS 9-12 Physical Science

1. HS-PS1-2 What exactly would students be revising? Are they expected to identify the type of reaction, predict the products and/or explain why certain products form? Needs to be modified to be more specific.
2. HS-PS1-4 Not appropriate for introductory classes nor for general chemistry courses
3. HS-PS1-5 What type of model would students be expected to do? It's very vague. There is already a model. Are students supposed to interpret energy graphs or create reaction energy graphs?
4. HS-PS1-7 Not appropriate for chemistry I nor physical science.
5. HS-PS2-3 Use the words impulse standard instead of "macroscopic".
6. HS-PS3-1 Is this standard written to address conservation of energy? If it is it is very poorly written.
7. HS-PS3-2 Use the wording "total energy of an object is the sum of the kinetic and potential energy of the object".
8. HS-PS3-4 Clarification statement of $q = (m)(c)(\Delta T)$ would be helpful

Concerns with physical science standards:

1. They are simply too vague to be helpful to prepare teachers to instruct students.
2. There are many standards that seem to no longer be covered that were important concepts and shouldn't be deleted.
 - a. Examples: properties of mixtures; acidic, basic and neutral solutions; physical changes as related to the Kinetic Theory of Matter; predicting effect of temperature and pressure changes on matter; energy is conserved within a system.
3. Teachers would need sample activities for all standards because the wording is so vague that it is difficult to determine how the students would be tested over that standard.
4. It seems that many of the old standards were simply compressed into one standard. The problem with this is that we don't know which parts of the old standard are still valid. It is possible that the intentions of some of the standards that are no long included might be a part of the new "combined" standard, but it is difficult to tell with the current wording.
5. The proposed standards are not user friendly.

Karen Hammond
Chemistry Teacher
Rolla High School
573-458-0140, ext. 14228

From: [Gier, Robin](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:59:06 AM

When looking at the proposed standards for first grade, I am very disappointed with the science and social studies. The social studies focuses all symbols and learning on Community. My grade level team was very confused about what the expectations for community would be. They were very vaguely written and confusing. Science was also vague and honestly boring. We can't expect kids to get into older grades and learn more complex standards without giving them a foundation to build upon. We should at least be introducing concepts to them. As an educator, I would be terribly disappointed if the science and social studies pass in their current form.

Robin Gier

First Grade
Morgan County R-2
913 West Newton
Versailles, MO 65084

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Morgan County R-II School District, Versailles, Missouri, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

From: [Sheila Cravens](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Math Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 1:49:57 PM

I wish to express my concern over the proposed math standards. At the second grade level, students are supposed to tell and write time from analog and digital clocks to the nearest five minutes, using a.m. and p.m. At the first grade level, time is not even a required standard. In order for second graders to be successful with this standard, I feel that students need some prior knowledge with clocks, telling time to the hour and half-hour. Also, at the second grade level, students are to find the value of combinations of dollar bills, quarters, dimes, nickels and pennies, using \$ and ¢ appropriately and find combinations of coins that equal a given amount. Again, prior knowledge from first grade of at least coin recognition would be helpful for student mastery at the second grade level. Thank you for your consideration of my concern.

--
Sheila Cravens
Second Grade Teacher
Grovespring Elementary School

From: [McClard, Laura](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Matthew Lacy](#); [John Link](#); [Shannon Heisserer](#); [Elprincipals](#)
Subject: K-5 Standard Recommendations
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 2:23:36 PM

On behalf of the Jackson R-2 elementary teachers in grades K-5, the instructional facilitators have compiled and attached a list of specific recommendations for improving the clarity of the proposed K-5 standards. Thank you for your consideration!



Proposed Standards Suggestions 2-25-16

Shannon Heisserer and L aura McClard

Instructional Facilitator

s

Jackson R-2 Schools

Email: lmccclard@jr2mail.org

Phone: (573) 579-2251



General recommendations

- Elementary teachers are responsible for standards in all 4 content areas. If you could standardize the coding as far as where you list the grade level, the strand, the letter, the number, that would really be appreciated. Not to mention, that the names of some strands have changed and now the letters used to abbreviate them as well. Elementary Teachers have been expected to learn way too many coding systems.
- Changing all four content areas in one year for elementary teachers is going to cause Missouri teachers much additional time and effort to plan lessons and gather suitable teaching materials. Phasing in one content area at a time would have been less overwhelming for teachers and students.
- For math, it would be helpful for teachers to see a learning progression if the standards that build on each other from grade to grade are listed beside each other horizontally. For example, in kindergarten “identify pennies, nickels, dimes” is on p. 22, but the 1st grade standard is on p. 24, and the 2nd grade standards are on p. 26. This happens throughout the document. A linear progression across the table would make more sense to teachers.
- Throughout math standards, “solve problems” is used frequently. It is unclear whether or not this includes word problems or not. If “word problems” are an expectation, then it needs to be clearly stated.
- For ELA, it would be helpful if the standards indicated by lowercase letters aligned vertically. For instance, “recognize beginning, middle, and end” is R.1.A.Ka in kindergarten and R.1.A.1f in first grade.
- In social studies, having fifth grade cover 1800- 2000 is going to make it difficult to find teaching materials. Fifth grade has not covered that time span in the past. If they are going to be required to teach this time period, supplementary teaching materials need to be made available.
- In social studies, many standards differ among grade level by only one verb. These verbs will be difficult for teachers to differentiate among. The verbs need to be defined, or the standards need to be worded differently among the grade levels to indicate the exact difference.
- In science, there are multiple standards aligned to one code. It is recommended that each standard have its own code, or add little letters to designate each standard.
- In science, the inquiry standards and their action verbs were removed and incorporated with various standards. Too many standards are asking kids to build a model, develop or design a machine, use materials to solve problems, make a claim, construct an argument, compare investigations, etc. to the point that some of the content is lost. Elementary teachers are not content area specialists and rely on the standards to define content, not just performance at their grade level. Overall, there are many standards that are way too difficult for teachers to interpret.

- The science standards do not reference specific tools, measurements, and units students should use throughout the content. These need to be explicitly stated or teachers will not know what each grade level is responsible for. In addition, this may cause confusion with the data collection within inquiry.
- In science, the entire Engineering and TEchnology strand is too difficult to interpret. Solve problems is way too vague . Teachers will have difficulty embedding these within the content of their grade level. Consider using the wording of the old science, technology, and inquiry GLEs or listing specific examples to help define those terms.

ELA K-5

- In the R.D.1 standards, grades 1-5 have “producing evidence of reading.” The type of evidence is unclear. Recommend giving examples of evidence and stating whether it should be written or oral.
- In the poetry standards, students need to identify forms of poetry. Recommend listing the forms students need to know at which grade levels.
- In the text features standards, recommend listing the specific signs and symbols that students need to know the meaning of
- In the reading foundations standards for 2nd grade, the “identifying and reading abbreviations” is too vague. Recommend stating whether the abbreviations are titles of people, geographic locations, etc.
- In the language standards, the difference between the 2nd grade and 3rd grade standards regarding dialogue are unclear. The capitalization and punctuation of dialogue are in third grade. Recommend clarifying exactly what students are responsible for in 2nd grade.
- R.3.A.Kd and R.3.A.1e are vague. Recommend giving examples of which specific signs and symbols.
- In the Reading Foundational Skills, recommend that the syllable types be specifically assigned to a grade level(s). Also, recommend adding syllable counting to the standards.

Social Studies K-5

- 1.B.4 recommend listing the important principles in the U.S. constitution
- 1.C.4 recommend listing the important principles in the Bill of Rights
- 1.F.2 recommend stating which national symbols should be recognized and explained
- 2.C.2 “various levels and branches” is unclear. Recommend clarifying which levels and branches need to be covered in grade 2.
- 3a.B.2 is **very** broad. Recommend specifying specific Native American tribes.

- 3a.C.K and 1 are worded exactly the same. Recommend assigning specific individuals to each grade level to reduce redundancy.
- 3a.C.2-5 all are vague. Recommend giving examples of individuals who could be studied.
- 5.B.2 the word “regions” is unclear. Recommend defining this or using the terms continents and oceans. If oceans are included, recommend listing them (Is the Southern Ocean to be considered an ocean?).
- 5.B.4 and 5 are worded exactly the same. Recommend splitting up the material, or putting it on one grade level.
- 5.C.2 “physical characteristics of the world” is unclear. Recommend defining the term or giving examples.
- 5.D.4 differs from 5.D.5 by the verb. The difference between “analyze” and “evaluate” is unclear. Recommend changing the verbs or giving examples to clarify.
- 5.E.2 the second paragraph is incomplete
- 5.E.3,4, and 5 differ by only the verb. “describe,” “analyze,” and “evaluate” are unclear. Recommend giving examples or defining the verbs as they are used here.
- 5.F.4 and 5 differ by only one verb. 4th grade has to “identify” and 5th grade has to “describe.” Both grades have to analyze the effect on humans. Recommend moving the human part to grade 5 only.
- 7.A.1-5 differ only by verbs. The difference among these verbs is unclear and vague. Recommend defining the verbs or giving examples.
- 7.B.4 and 5 have the same standard with slightly different wording. The only difference is that 5th grade has “as needed” to the with guidance and support part. Recommend changing 4th grade to “with guidance and support” and 5th grade as “independently.”
- The shift of state government to third grade and pushing history up through 2000 in grade 5 will create a hardship in many districts as they attempt to allocate resources for teachers.

Math K-5

- K.RA.A4 standard wording is unclear. We suggest: Find the number that makes 10 when added to a given number.
- K.RA.A1 standard verb “represent” is too vague. Recommend giving examples to help define “represent.”
- K.GM.A1 and K.GM.A2 both include term “attributes.” Recommend giving examples or listing the attributes kindergartners should learn.
- K.GM.C2 “relative positions” is vague. Recommend listing the positional words kindergartners should learn.

- K.GM.C3 “attributes” is too vague. Recommend listing the attributes kindergartners should learn.
- 1.NBT.B1 unclear whether or not this standard includes regrouping. If that is part of this expectation, it needs to be stated within the standard.
- 1.NBT.B1 unclear whether or not this standard includes word problems. If so, it needs to be clearly stated within the standard.
- 1.RA.B1 unclear what properties 1st graders are expected to know. Recommend listing the properties within the standard.
- 1.GM.A1- unclear what attributes 1st graders are supposed to know. Recommend listing attributes or giving examples of them.
- 1.GM.A2-unclear what 2-d and 3-d shapes 1st graders should know. Recommend listing the shapes 1st graders are expected to know. Also, what properties should they know?
- 1.GM.A4- unclear what “verbally” includes. Recommend listing the verbal terms first grade students are expected to learn.
- 2.NBT.C1- unclear what the verb “write” means and unclear whether or not this includes word problems. Recommend replacing “write” with a stronger verb and clearly stating “word problems” if they should be included in this standard.
- 2.GM.B1- unclear what “tools” 2nd graders are supposed to use. Recommend listing the tools 2nd graders should learn to use.
- 3rd grade fractions strand- it is unclear whether or not 3rd graders should recognize whole numbers as fractions. If this is included, it needs to be explicitly stated.
- 3.RA.A4- unclear whether or not this standard includes word problems. If so, it needs to be clearly stated within the standard.
- 3.RA.C2- unclear whether or not this includes division facts as well. I also don’t see this listed at any elementary grade.
- 3.RA.A4 and 3.RA.C1- the difference between these standards is unclear. Recommend combining them into one standard or changing the wording so teachers know how they are different.
- 3.GM.B4 and 3.GM.B5- unclear what units and tools 3rd graders are expected to learn. Recommend listing the units and tools within the standard.
- 4.GM.C.1- unclear what units 4th graders are expected to learn. Recommend listing the units and tools within the standard.
- 4.NF.B1- unclear whether or not this standard refers to fractions with like denominators, unlike denominators, or both. Recommend stating “like” or “unlike” within the standard.
- 5th grade - unclear whether or not 5th graders are expected to learn the standard algorithm for multiplication and division. If so, then this needs to be stated within the standard. If not, then it needs to be stated at the grade level in which this is expected.

- 5.NF.A1, 5.NF.A3, 5.NF.B1 all have fractions and decimals within the standards. It is unclear whether the operations or verbs should be performed on fractions and decimals mixed together or in isolation. Do 5th graders solve problems in which one number is given as a decimal and another as a fraction?
- 5th grade division- none of the standards state that students should express the remainder of a division problem as a fraction. This needs to be clearly stated within a standard or as a new standard. Perhaps it goes with 5.NBT.A8?
- 5.RA.C1- It is unclear whether all of these numbers should be part of the same word problem (i.e. should the word problem include one number as a fraction, another as a decimal, another as a whole number)??
- 5.GM.D1- unclear what units 5th graders are expected to know. Recommend listing the units within the standard.
- 5.DS.A1 and 5.DS.A2- unclear whether data refers to whole numbers, decimals, or fractions. If students are expected to work with data in decimal or fraction form, then this needs to be stated within the standard.

Science K-5

- The four seasons seems to be left out altogether. Should that appear at Kindergarten or 1st grade??
- 1.PS1A- second standard includes mass/weight. Those terms are not the same thing and should not be used interchangeably. Recommend only including one of these terms or changing the standard to reflect that mass and weight are different from each other.
- 1.PS3A and 1.PS3B and 1.PS4B are all the exact same standard wording.
- 1.LS1A- unclear what this standard even means. Give examples of human problems and how you would mimic plants/animals external parts to survive.
- 2.PS1A- second standard listed states “testing different materials” but it’s unclear how or what you would test with. Honestly, I have no idea what this standard even means. If this is related to mixtures and solutions, then I think those terms should be used somewhere in the standard.
- K.PS2A and K.PS2B have the exact same standard wording. Remove one of them.
- K.PS2A it’s unclear whether or not this standard includes describing an object’s position (i.e. positional words) and whether or not tools should be used to generate the push/pull (i.e. magnets)
- K.ESS2E examples of how plants and animals change the environment need to be listed.
- K.ETS1B and K.ETS1C (these same standards for K-2) are extremely vague and wordy to interpret. Examples of objects and their functions, as well as multiple objects used to solve a problem need to be given. Not sure how to relate these to the content standards for K-2. “Communicate observations using words, pictures, and numbers”

was easier to understand. If “objects” are supposed to refer to human made vs. natural, then that should be stated.

- ETS1A, ETS1B, ETS1C, at all grade levels (K-5) has too many vague words/phrases. “make observations” needs to have examples given, as well as tools that students at each level are expected to use. “objects” and “Tools” are not connected to any specific content topic, so it is unclear what either of these refer to, so examples need to be listed. “criteria” and “constraints” of the problem are difficult to even understand. Examples need to be given. I don’t think that elementary teachers are able to interpret these standards mean or determine how they connect to the content.
- ETS1B and ETS1C (grades 3-5) include a standard that is repeated in two places. “plan and carry out....” only needs to be listed one time.
- 1.ESS2D standard doesn’t state that measurements or recordings need to be made. If this is an expectation, then it needs to be clearly stated. In addition, the tools 1st graders are expected to use should be listed as well.
- 2.PS2A unclear whether this standard defines a change in motion as direction or distance or both. These term(s) should be explicitly stated. In addition, examples of force and examples of motion should be included.
- 2.PS4A unclear whether change in sound refers to pitch, loudness, or both. Also, do students need to be able to describe how the ear hears sound?
- 2.ESS1C Earth events is unclear. Please define or give examples of
- 2.ESS2A examples of solutions as well as the changes/processes need to be explicitly stated. This is unclear.
- 2.ESS2B unclear what shapes and kinds of land or water bodies means. Is this landforms (mountains, valleys, etc.) or continents? naming oceans, rivers, lakes? or types of water (fresh, salt)? Examples of shapes, land, water bodies should be included in the standard.
- 2.ESS2C unclear how “where water is found on the earth” different from water bodies mentioned in standard 2.ESS2B? Also, “obtain information” is vague and adds nothing to the standard’s rigor.
- 5.PS1A refers to “total weight of matter” being conserved. Shouldn’t that be mass?
- 4.PS3A unclear whether “energy” means students should know kinetic and potential energy at this grade level. Need to explicitly state if it’s included.
- 4.PS2A unclear whether distance is included in this standard. Also, unclear what measurement units and tools should be used by students at this grade level.
- It is also unclear when students should classify the different types of motion and when they should understand motion in terms of distance and time. Is that included at 2nd grade (2.PS2A) or 4th grade (4.PS2A)?
- 4.PS3B unclear of the difference between the first and second standard listed here. Also, the third standard listed refers to designing or refining a “device” that converts

energy. Please include examples to demonstrate what this means. It is also unclear whether or not this includes electric circuits, conductors, insulators as stated in our old GLEs. If so, these standards need to be explicitly stated.

- 4.PS4A if amplitude and wavelength are not assessed, then what is supposed to be included in models of waves? If this includes the types of waves (transverse, longitudinal, etc.) then that needs to be stated. Otherwise, it needs to be stated what these models of waves should include.
- 5.PS3C unclear whether this standard also includes comparing and describing the amount of force, if students are supposed to know the various simple machines and how they work, and whether students are expected to measure this force.
- 5.PS3B and 5.PS4B go together and should be listed together under energy transfer.
- 3.LS3A unclear whether “organisms” refers to only plants, only animals, or should include both plants and animals.
- 3.LS1A unclear whether “organisms” refers to only plants, only animals, or should include both plants and animals. Also, it is unclear which adaptations and behaviors 3rd graders are expected to know.
- 4.LS1A is unclear what “internal and external structures” a 4th grader should know. Also, how is this objective different from the structures 3rd graders are supposed to know in 3.LS1A??
- 3.LS4C and 3.LS1A are the same standard word for word.
- 3.LS4B characteristics is unclear and examples need to be given
- 3.LS4D “make a claim about the merit of a solution to a problem caused” is way too wordy . What does that mean?
- 4.LS1D is unclear. Is this referring to internal and external cues? is this referring to body adaptations/structures?
- 5.LS1C does this standard include knowing and illustrating the transport system of a plant?
- Unclear at which grade level students are supposed to know the structures and functions of plants. This was previously split between 1st and 3rd grade in our old GLEs. This needs to be explicitly stated in whichever new standard this is supposed to be a part of.
- 5.LS2B-unclear whether this includes knowing producers, consumers, decomposers, omnivore, herbivore, carnivore, and detritivore. Does this also include decay/rotting/composting/digestion? The wording from our old GLEs (3rd grade EC2A and 4th grade EC2A) was clearly stated so teachers knew what was included.
- 4.ESS2B-unclear what patterns and Earth features students should know. The category to the left says plate tectonics. Is this supposed to be related to how weathering and erosion shape the Earth or is this supposed to be Earth’s features like previously taught in the Universe strand?

- 4.ESS1C unclear whether or not this standard includes observing, describing, and comparing properties of rocks and knowing the different types of rocks?? Also, does this include describing and comparing properties of soil?
- 5.ESS2A unclear whether or not this standard includes all parts of the water cycle and different forms of precipitation.
- 5.ESS2C unclear whether or not this includes classifying bodies of water. Also, “various reservoirs” needs to be explained or examples need to be listed.
- 3.ESS2D unclear whether this standard also includes using appropriate tools to gather weather data. If so, this needs to be explicitly stated, as well as which tools 3rd graders should use.
- 3.ESS2C also unclear which climates and regions 3rd graders should know. Please list examples within standard.

From: [McClard, Laura](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [John Link](#); [Matthew Lacy](#); [Shannon Heisserer](#); [Elprincipals](#)
Subject: K-5 Standard Recommendations
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 2:34:32 PM
Attachments: [ProposedStandardsSuggestions2-25-16.pdf](#)

On behalf of the Jackson R-2 elementary teachers in grades K-5, the instructional facilitators have compiled and attached a list of specific recommendations for improving the clarity of the proposed K-5 standards. Thank you for your consideration!

We are resubmitting these comments as a PDF document. Sorry for any confusion.

Laura McClard

Instructional Facilitator

Jackson R-2 Schools

Email: lmccclard@jr2mail.org

Phone: (573) 579-2251



From: [Yeokum, Sandra](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Yeokum, Sandra](#)
Subject: Comments regarding the draft of the new Missouri State Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 3:49:48 PM

1490Comments@dese.mo.gov

After reviewing the draft of the new Missouri State Standards, I feel that there are several areas of concern in all subject matters. I feel that the standards are very vague, and there needs to be more examples given to determine what needs assessed. I feel that the Science is very broad and needs to be broken down to specific goals. The Social Studies standards level of content seems very difficult for each grade level and the concepts should remain at their current grade levels (example: 4th grade should still focus on Missouri History, 3rd grade should still focus branches of government and not Missouri history, etc.) As a 2nd grade teacher, I feel that 2nd graders are still trying to understand the concept of their local community and how that type of government works.

In the Math standards, 2nd grade is the only grade level that introduces, teaches, and assesses money. I would like to have some clarification on what is expected for fluency for basic math facts for addition and subtraction within 100. For the Writing standards, I feel that 2nd graders are still working on learning how to print legibly with correct spacing and knowing when to capitalize and should not be expected to use cursive writing until 3rd grade.

Thank you for taking the time to review my comments, and I hope that you will take them into consideration.

Sandra Yeokum
Second Grade
United for Tiger Excellence
Morgan County R2 Schools
Versailles Elementary
yeokums@mcr2.k12.mo.us

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Morgan County R-II School District, Versailles, Missouri, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

From: [Cloe Billington](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Vitt, Aaron](#)
Subject: New Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 4:30:13 PM

In reviewing the new science standards specifically, I have the following concerns:

Science is now expected to be taught at lower grade levels, and thus curriculum will have to be changed at all grade levels to make sure content is being learned at the correct grade.

Some content to be learned at earlier grade levels may be too challenging as students in HS level classes already struggle with this content.

New courses may need to be implemented at the high school level to cover all the curriculum, especially Earth Science. Would this change the high school graduation requirements to 4 science credits, instead of 3?

Thank you,

--

Cloe' Billington
Paris R-II HS
660-327-4111

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Rigor in ELA
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:51:57 PM

The proposed standards lack rigor and clarity in many instances. Below is one example of the loss of clarity in the proposed standards. MLS have CLEARLY defined expectations and performance levels. The word "appropriate" is left undefined in the proposed standards and that does not create quality or uniform expectations for Missouri's children. Below is an example from grade 4, but this same concern exists in grades K-5.

For comparison between MLS and Proposed Standards in clarity

MLS states: Grade 4- Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: By the end of the year, read and comprehend informational text, including history/social studies, science and technical texts in the grades 4-5 text complexity band proficiently with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.	Proposed standards: Grade 4- Develop and apply skills to the reading process Read independently for sustained periods of time by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. reading text that is developmentally appropriateb. producing evidence of reading
--	---

*MLS standards much more clear and rigorous. It sets clear expectation levels for instruction and assessment.

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

“Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be.”~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Concerns
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:54:24 PM

Proposed Standards

Reading 1A Develop and apply skills to the reading process

Grades 4 and 5 states:

“Develop and demonstrate reading skills in response to text”.

This standard lacks clarity to the point that it would be difficult to implement. It is essentially a regurgitation of the strand itself.

The reading skills that need developed and demonstrated need to be clearly defined. The type of text they are responding to also should be defined (Informational, literature, poetry, all texts, etc).

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

“Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be.”~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Concerns
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:57:40 PM

I believe that the Missouri History Standards should remain in 4th grade and not be moved to 3rd grade. 3rd grade is already a transitional year from what many consider primary grades into upper elementary school. There is no reason to move this standard in my opinion. It creates an overload in third grade.

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

"Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be."~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: ELA concerns
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 6:01:51 PM

Organization of the clusters lacks clarity – for example in Reading 6-12, standards are identified as “Approaching text as a reader” and “Approaching text as a writer”.

These type of phrases do not give clarity. It is left up for interpretation and unfortunately will be interpreted in many ways across the state. That does not provide unity, stability or focus, all of which are needed for students who are transient and for accountability measures (assessment).

How would you assess approaching text as a reader? That is too broad of a statement and not clearly defined, thus making assessment unreliable and difficult.

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

“Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be.”~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Writing Standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 6:02:39 PM

The proposed writing standards are redundant and lack focus in individual grade levels.

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

“Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be.”~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: concerns -science
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 6:04:47 PM

There are concerns about the amount of "modeling" that is expected in the science standards. The term modeling is not clear and how do you assess this in a state test?

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

"Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be."~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Jenny Ulrich](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Overall concerns
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 6:19:47 PM

The proposed standards seem to regress in rigor, clarity and complexity. Alignment across strands in ELA is a concern as well. They do not fit together and spiral the way that our current MLS do. There is a large amount of redundancy in the proposed standards which steals priceless educational time from children. We need FOCUSED standards for EACH grade level. Repeating vague, broad expectations from year to year has no leverage for our students.

Teachers have worked hard to increase rigor, intentionality and clarity in the classrooms, only to move backwards with new, less rigorous standards that are not aligned, spiraled or clear (if adopted).

As an administrator I have a vast amount of concern regarding the resources available to support our state and teachers if we move away from our current MLS. Of course there is the concern about the assessment piece with Smarter Balance or PARC. However, more importantly....teachers have a VAST amount of resources available to them that affects daily instruction and professional growth. **There is an enormous network of educators across our nation sharing resources on sites such as Twitter, teachers pay teachers, blogs and even Pinterest. Missouri teachers are engaging in professional learning networks and conversations with educators in other states that were never before possible. They are growing at a compound rate because of the uniform standards, networking and the vast amount of resources available to them. It would be a travesty to take all of those resources away and isolate Missouri's teachers and children.**

Jenny L. Ulrich

Superintendent
Lonedell R-14 School District

“Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists they become the best they can possibly be.”~Rita Pierson

Lonedell R-14 School District
7466 Hwy FF
Lonedell, Missouri 63060
Phone 636-629-0401
Fax 636-629-5561
julrich@lonedell.org

From: [Bolton, Mollie](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: comments on standards
Date: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:12:46 PM

I am very concerned about the adoption of these new standards. There is a lack of vertical alignment in many of the subject areas which will lead to disjointed and inconsistent education for the students of Missouri. These standards do not seem to be based in research best practices that support effective structure and framework for quality instruction. I am also very concerned with many of the current standards that have been eliminated. Many of these standards covered skills that many higher education institutes and companies have stated that our students are lacking to be successful post -secondary – this includes many of the speaking and listening standards that worked on communication and collaborative problem solving. These skills are vital for Missouri students to become successful in a competitive job market and be college and career ready.

Also, this major change in the standards will cost districts hundreds of thousands of dollars in the way of rewriting curriculums (which many of us just completed in the past year or two) and curriculum resources which we have purchased recently to be aligned to the current standards. The professional development time and money that has been spent on teachers for the recently adopted standards and will need to be spent again for these new standards.

Also by adopting these standards we are limiting Missouri educators access to millions of resources that are currently available that we and other states have developed to support these common standards that would enhance the education of Missouri students. This collaboration with other states would save the state and school districts many hours of PD, costs of resources and hours of having to develop comparable resources for new standards. We are also limiting the power of Missouri educators to collaborate with other educators across the country. Have we shown that the current standards are not meeting our goal of creating college and career ready students? I think the answer is we haven't even given them the chance yet. So our students will experience another year of uncertainty while we try to make up our minds of what needs to be taught and when and try to fill in the gaps that have been created by changing the standards yet again. Is this fair to our students and teachers?

I encourage you to consider these implications with the adoption of these new standards.

Mollie Bolton

Dr. Mollie Bolton, Ed.D.
Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction
Special School District of St. Louis County
314-989-8246

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

NOTICE: Any information contained in or attached to this message is intended solely for the use of the intended recipients(s) and may contain confidential information. Any review, retransmission,

dissemination of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this communication by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please contact the sender and discard the communication sent in error.

From: 1490Comments
Subject: FW: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

From: Deenna Burris [<mailto:dburris@manes.k12.mo.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 10:31 PM
To: 1490Comments
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

Continue to address earlier standards as needed and as applies to more difficult texts

I am a teacher of only 10 years but allowing it to stop like this will provide for interpretation. As much as it may be horrible to seem repetitive, there will always be teachers who do not read the years before or after their own grade levels. Including words such as justify and evidence is probably essential to include in even the 1st and 2nd grade level standards for retell and discussion of main idea. Students even in k and 1 can point out or explain why they think what they think (evidence).